

Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. Claims 1, 4, 8, 15 and 17 have been amended. Claims 2, 3, 9, 10 and 16 have been canceled. No claims have been added. Thus, claims 1, 4-8, 11-15 and 17-21 are pending.

OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

The specification was objected to for informalities. The informalities identified by the Office Action have been corrected herein. Accordingly, Applicants request that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 1, 8 and 15 were objected to for informalities. The informalities identified by the Office Action have been corrected herein. Accordingly, Applicants request that the objection to the claims be withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

Claims 7 and 12-14 were rejected as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Specifically, claims 7 and 12-14 were rejected as lacking proper antecedent basis. The claims have been amended herein to correct the lack of proper antecedent basis. Accordingly, Applicants request that the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph be withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 8 and 15 were rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,052,789 issued to Lin (*Lin*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,711,043 issued to Friedman, et al. (*Friedman*). Claims 1, 8 and 15 have been amended to include subject matter indicated as allowable. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 1, 8 and 15 are now in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 2, 7-9 and 12-16 were rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0230848 of Mayo, et al. (*Mayo*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,732,238 issued to Sarkory (*Sarkory*). Claims 2, 9 and 16 have been canceled. Therefore, the rejection of claims 2, 9 and 16 is moot. Claims 1, 7, 8 and 12-15 have either been amended to include subject matter indicated as allowable or depend from a claim including allowable subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 1, 7, 8 and 12-15 are in condition for allowance.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 3-6, 10, 11 and 16-21 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1, 4-8, 11-15 and 17-21 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the

undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: April 17, 2006


Paul A. Mendonsa
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 42,879

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 439-8778